REMARKS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claims 12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,614,126 to Carlson (hereinafter "Carlson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,501,167 to Palowsky (hereinafter "Palowsky"); Claims 17, 18, 21, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Carlson in view of Palowsky as applied to claims 12 and 19, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,155,130 to Hanel (hereinafter "Hanel"); and claims 23-25, 29, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Carlson in view of Palowsky as applied to claim 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,588,206 to Powers (hereinafter "Powers"). The applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

Carlson teaches a device for stabilizing vehicles and reducing the tendency of a vehicle to skid. Carlson's device is mounted within the trunk. [Carlson, col. 2, line 43] Carlson's device includes a mass which functions to provide stabilization for the vehicle and is somewhat elongated in a transverse or lateral direction. [Carlson, col. 2, lines, 55-58] Carlson teaches that the mass is rotatably supported by a vertical balancing rod [Carlson, col. 2, line 62-63 and Figure 3] and is maintained in its initial undeflected position by four obliquely disposed helical springs [Carlson, col. 2, lines 73-75 and Figure 3]. In another embodiment Carlson teaches masses which are rigidly supported on top of spring supports and deflect at an angle with respect to a vertical line passing through the plane of the base of the device. Carlson teaches that the stabilizer assembly is constructed to provide a preferred axis of response to transient forces and that the angle of rearward inclination is preferably an angle which will prevent the support means from assuming a vertical disposition with respect to the base. [Carlson, col. 4, lines 24-48].

Carlson does not teach a device which is mounted on a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal direction of the car. Carlson teaches away from a mass moving along the guiding axis between the front and back of the car. In particular, Carlson only teaches that the mass either moves in a lateral direction with respect to the car or swings in an arc around a base support which deflects at an angle to the vertical.

The Examiner also points out that Carlson teaches that it is known in the art to use a drum biased along a single guiding axis as a stabilizer in a vehicle. However, Carlson teaches away from a movement of the mass in a longitudinal direction parallel to the length of the car. Carlson teaches that the mass slides along a rod extending *transversely* between the rear wheels. Moreover, Carlson teaches a stabilization device, not a braking device as in the present invention. [Carlson, col. 1, lines 36-46]

Palowsky teaches a vehicle stabilizer which is mounted in a substantially horizontal position on the rear end portion of the vehicle and *parallel* to the rear axle. [Palowsky, col. 1, lines 46-50] Palowsky does not teach a braking device which is mounted on a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal direction of the car. In particular, Palowsky does not teach a mass moving along the guiding axis between the front and back of the car.

In contrast to both Carlson and Palowsky, the present invention teaches that the braking buffer device has a guiding axis from the front to the back of the motorcar and a weighty drum which is capable of moving along the guiding axis, the guiding axis confining the direction of motion of said weighty drum between the front and the back of the motorcar.

Because neither Carlson nor Palowsky provide for a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal axis of the car which restrains the movement of the mass along the guiding axis, no combination of the references can result in a teaching for a breaking device oriented parallel to the longitudinal axis of the car and restricted to that axis. Thus, the claimed invention cannot be obvious in view of these references or any combination thereof.

The independent Claim 12 is directed to a breaking buffer device comprising *a guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of motorcar*; a weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said guiding axis equal to a length of said weighty drum such that *said weighty drum is capable of moving along said guiding axis, said guiding axis confining motion of said weighty drum between said front and said back of said motorcar*, said weighty drum having a predefined resting position upon said guiding axis wherein said weighty drum moves toward said front of said motorcar when brakes of said motorcar are engaged while said motorcar is in motion and said weighty drum returns to said predefined resting position after said motorcar slows down or comes to a stop; and a recovery device tending to bias said weighty drum to said predefined resting position. As discussed above, neither Carlson nor Palowsky teaches a braking device having a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal axis of the car which restrains the movement of a weighty drum along the guiding axis. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, and any combination thereof.

Claims 14-16, 19, and 20 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. As described above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, and any combination thereof. Accordingly, Claims 14-16, 19, and 20 are also allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim. These claims add limitations further distinguishing over the cited art.

The independent Claim 26 is directed to a braking buffer device for a motorcar having a front and a back, said braking buffer device comprising *a guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said motorcar*, said guiding axis being tilted downward towards said front of said motorcar, a weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said guiding axis equal to a length of said weighty drum such that said weighty drum is capable of moving along said guiding axis, *said guiding axis confining motion of said weighty drum between said front and said back of said motorcar*, said weighty drum having a predefined resting position upon said guiding axis positioned towards said back of said motorcar, and a recovery device tending to bias said weighty drum to said predefined resting position. As discussed above, neither Carlson nor Palowsky teaches a braking device having a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal axis of the car which restrains the movement of a weighty drum along the guiding axis. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 26 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, and any combination thereof.

The independent Claim 27 is directed to a braking buffer device for a motorcar traveling in a longitudinal direction, said braking buffer device characterized in that said braking buffer device operates to temporally transfer longitudinal momentum to a weighty drum that is biased to the rear of said motorcar when braking thereby tending to increase the comfort and safety of the car wherein *said braking buffer device* *circumferentially surrounds a portion of a guiding axis equal to a length of said braking buffer device such that said braking buffer device is capable of moving along said guiding axis.* As discussed above, neither Carlson nor Palowsky teaches a braking device having a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal axis of the car which restrains the movement of a weighty drum along the guiding axis. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 27 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, and any combination thereof.

The independent Claim 28 is directed to a car having a front and a back and a left and a right, said car comprising a left braking buffer device comprising *a left guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said car, a left weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said left guiding axis equal to a length of said left weighty drum such that said left weighty drum is capable of moving along said left guiding axis, said left guiding axis confining motion of said left weighty drum between said front and said back of said car*, and a right braking buffer device including *a right guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said car, a right weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said right guiding axis equal to a length of said right weighty drum such that said right weighty drum is capable of moving along said right guiding axis, said right guiding axis confining motion of said right weighty drum between said front and said back of said car.* As discussed above, neither Carlson nor Palowsky teaches a braking device having a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal axis of the car which restrains the movement of a weighty drum along the guiding axis. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 28 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, and any combination thereof.

Claims 28 and 29 are dependent on the independent Claim 27. As described above, the independent Claim 27 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, and any combination thereof. Accordingly, Claims 28 and 29 are also allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim. These claims add limitations further distinguishing over the cited art.

Hanel teaches an anti-skidding device which is arranged transversely to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle, preferably as far as possible behind the rear axle.

[Hanel, col. 1, lines 43-45] Hanel does not teach the use of a mass which slides along a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle.

Powers teaches a vehicle stabilizer adapted to be secured transversely to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle. [Powers, col. 1, lines 55-57] The stabilizer is mounted on a rear portion of the vehicle, and preferably rearwardly of the rear axle of the vehicle to be most effective. [Powers, col. 2, lines 43-46] Powers does not teach the use of a mass which slides along a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle.

Because Carlson, Palowsky, Hanel, and Powers each do not provide for a guiding axis parallel to the longitudinal axis of the car which restrains the movement of the mass along the guiding axis, no combination of the references can result in a teaching for a breaking device oriented parallel to the longitudinal axis of the car and restricted to that axis. Thus, the claimed invention cannot be obvious in view of these references or any combination thereof.

Claims 17, 18, 21, and 22 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. As described above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, Hanel, and any combination thereof. Accordingly, Claims 17, 18, 21, and 22 are also allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim. These claims add limitations further distinguishing over the cited art.

Claims 23-25 are dependent on the independent Claim 12. As described above, the independent Claim 12 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, and Powers and any combination thereof. Accordingly, Claims 23-25 are also allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim. These claims add limitations further distinguishing over the cited art.

Claims 29 and 30 are dependent on the independent Claim 28. As described above, the independent Claim 28 is allowable over the teachings of Carlson, Palowsky, and Powers and any combination thereof. Accordingly, Claims 29 and 30 are also allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim. These claims add limitations further distinguishing over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel at the number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: May 14, 2007

Lisa Liou
Lisa Liou
Registration No. 54,275

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P. O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, CA 94026-2168
(650) 838-4300